

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 18, 20-21, 23-24, and 26 are currently pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 18, and 24 are independent.

Claim Objection

Claim 1 is objected to because the terms "objective parameters" and "noise constraints" are unclear.

Applicant respectfully traverses this objection as follows.

Applicant respectfully submits "objective parameters" and "noise constraints" are sufficiently clear. This same terminology appears in the description and in other claims in the present application without objection. Also, this terminology appears in the claims of the patent that issued from the application parent to this application. It is fundamentally unfair to Applicant for the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to issue a patent from the parent application having this terminology in its claims and to now allege that that same terminology is unclear, without any elaboration, in a different set of claims supported by the same originally filed disclosure. Applicant respectfully requests an explanation as to how this same terminology could be considered clear in those other contexts yet not clear in claim 1 of the present application.

Applicant also respectfully submits this terminology is sufficiently clear as evidenced by the application of prior art against the claim in the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully submits this objection has been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of non-statutory double patenting over claim 1 of U.S. Patent 6,721,924 to Patra et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

Applicant respectfully submits with this Response to Office Action a Terminal Disclaimer which obviates this non-statutory double patenting rejection. Applicant therefore respectfully submits this rejection has been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,999,714 to Conn et al. ("Conn").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Claim 1 recites a computer implemented method comprising determining a set of objective parameters for a circuit.

Applicant respectfully submits that Conn did not teach or suggest such feature(s) as claimed. More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits the circuit with initial values of design parameters (block 2) and the list of design parameters and simple bounds on the parameter values (block 4) of Conn are received as inputs rather than determined as part of a computer implemented method.

Noting claims 10-13 depend from independent claim 1, Applicant therefore respectfully submits these rejections have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Note that there may be additional reasons for the patentability of claims. For example, there may be additional reasons why the dependent claims are patentable.

It is respectfully submitted this patent application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to help expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 18, 2006

/Matthew C. Fagan, Reg. No. 37,542/
Matthew C. Fagan
Registration No. 37,542
Telephone: (512) 732-3936
Facsimile: (512) 732-3912 (please call first)

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, L.L.P.
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Telephone: (310) 207-3800